

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 23, 2008. Claims 1-18 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 2 are the independent Claims. Claims 1-18 have been amended. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein.

Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

Non-Compliant Amendment

The response filed April 23, 2008 was objected to for improper strikethrough of words and characters having 5 or less characters. In response, Claims 1-12 are amended to recite double brackets where five or less characters are to be deleted. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objections are thus respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of April 16, 2008. Applicant has amended the claims as discussed during the telephone interview and, as also discussed during the telephone interview, submit that those claims are now in condition for allowance.

Non-Art Based Rejections

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the above rejections.

With respect to Claim 1, that claim has been amended to clarify the instruction codes are fetched and stored in the instruction queue, in order to overcome the rejection in paragraph 7.a. on page 3, lines 8 to 18 of the Office Action. In addition, Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that "based on" modifies "read out," an "instruction code" is read out from a memory and a "fetch circuit" fetches an "instruction

code" in the instruction queue, in order to overcome the rejection in paragraph 7.c. on page 3, line 19 to page 4, line 4 of the Office Action.

With respect to the rejection in paragraph 7.d. on page 4, lines 5 to 7 of the Office Action, it appears that the Office Action misunderstands the present invention. Applicant states that the branch setting instruction explicitly or implicitly covers the information concerning the branch occurring address 314, 414 and the information concerning the branch target address 316, 416, as illustrated in Figs. 3B and 5B. Moreover, the branch occurs when the fetch address matches with the branch occurring address. In other words, unlike the Office Action's contention, the branch occurring address is neither the address in the memory where the branch instruction is stored, nor the (branch) target address that is encoded in a branch (setting) instruction. Such branch occurring address is, for instance, address P1 in Fig. 3C, where the branch occurs. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of this feature amended claims 1 and 2 clearly specify that the branch occurring address is an address where the branch occurs, by "a branch to the branch target address occurring when the fetch address is the branch occurring address after a x-th instruction from the branch setting instruction."

Regarding Claim 2, that claim has been amended to overcome the rejection in paragraph 7.e. on page 4, line 8 of the Office Action.

Similarly, Claims 3 to 18 have been amended to clarify the recitations and to overcome the rejection in paragraph 8.a. on page 4, lines 9 to 14 of the Office Action.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

Appl. No. 10/601,005
Amendnet Dated August 6, 2008
Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant of July 11, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 81751.0061
Customer No.: 26021

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4721 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: August 6, 2008

By: 
Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601